



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,919	10/10/2001	Gregory K. Woods	000153	1081

23696 7590 10/20/2004

Qualcomm Incorporated
Patents Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, CA 92121-1714

EXAMINER

RYMAN, DANIEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2665

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/974,919	WOODS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel J. Ryman	2665	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5,6, and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, and 4-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 5 and 6 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claims 5 and 6 depend upon claim 3, which is a cancelled claim. For the purposes of prior art rejections, Examiner will interpret claims 5 and 6 to depend upon claim 1.

3. Claims 5 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities: "means for disabling said control inputs sets said outputs of said buffers to a high impedance state" should be "means for disabling said control inputs by setting said outputs of said buffers to a high impedance state" since this is easier to understand. Appropriate correction is required. In addition, the phrase in claim 5 should read "means for disabling control inputs" since "control inputs" lacks antecedent basis in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4-12, and 13-17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calvignac et al. (USPN 6,195,335) in view of Meyer (USPN 5,933,449).

6. Regarding claim 1, Calvignac discloses an apparatus for selectively interconnecting a plurality of ports, comprising: a cross-bar switch (ref. 110) (col. 2, lines 19-25 and col. 3, lines 16-18), having a plurality of input and outputs (col. 2, lines 19-25 and col. 3, lines 11-15), and a controller (input and output scheduler) (col. 2, lines 29-33; col. 2, lines 37-49; and col. 4, lines 17-20 and col. 4, lines 36-44), operable to control said cross-bar switch to interconnect any one of said plurality of inputs and any one of said plurality of outputs (input-output pair) (col. 2, lines 19-22), wherein said cross-bar switch includes a plurality of digital buffers (col. 2, lines 23-25 and col. 3, lines 44-50). Calvignac does not expressly disclose that the plurality of input and outputs comprise a plurality of bi-directional data ports. Meyer teaches, in a crossbar switching system, the plurality of input and outputs comprise a plurality of bi-directional data ports “[i]n order to allow an ensemble of machines to be interconnected in a flexible fashion” (col. 1, lines 31-38). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the plurality of input and outputs comprise a plurality of bi-directional data ports in order to allow an ensemble of machines to be interconnected in a flexible fashion.

7. Regarding claim 2, referring to claim 1, Calvignac in view of Meyer discloses that said plurality of bi-directional ports are adapted to interconnect RS-232 ports (Meyer: col. 12, line 59-col. 13, line 15).

8. Regarding claims 4 and 11, Calvignac discloses an apparatus, comprising: a plurality of n inputs and n outputs (col. 2, lines 19-25 and col. 3, lines 11-15); a plurality of $n(n-1)$ buffers (col. 2, lines 23-25 and col. 3, lines 44-50), each having an input, an output, and a control input (col.

Art Unit: 2665

2, lines 23-25 and col. 3, lines 44-50), and wherein said control inputs enable and disable the coupling of signals through said buffers, respectively (col. 2, lines 29-33; col. 2, lines 37-49; and col. 4, lines 17-20 and col. 4, lines 36-44); an interface controller (input and output scheduler) having a plurality of ($nC2$) control outputs, and operable to enable any one of said plurality of outputs individually (col. 2, lines 29-33; col. 2, lines 37-49; and col. 4, lines 17-20 and col. 4, lines 36-44), and wherein said outputs of a unique ($n-1$) of said plurality of buffers are coupled to said input of each one of said plurality of outputs (col. 2, lines 19-25); every one of said outputs is uniquely coupled to said input of one of said ($n-1$) plurality of buffers that are coupled to said inputs (col. 2, lines 19-25), such that said output is coupled to said input through a unique one of said plurality of buffers (col. 2, lines 19-25), and each one of said plurality of control outputs is coupled to said control inputs of the one of said plurality of buffers that couples a unique pair of the ($nC2$) combinations of said inputs and outputs (col. 2, lines 29-33; col. 2, lines 37-49; and col. 4, lines 17-20 and col. 4, lines 36-44). Calvignac does not expressly disclose that the plurality of input and outputs comprise a plurality of bi-directional interfaces. Meyer teaches, in a crossbar switching system, the plurality of input and outputs comprise a plurality of bi-directional interfaces “[i]n order to allow an ensemble of machines to be interconnected in a flexible fashion” (col. 1, lines 31-38). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the plurality of input and outputs comprise a plurality of bi-directional interfaces in order to allow an ensemble of machines to be interconnected in a flexible fashion.

9. Regarding claims 5 and 12, referring to claims 1 and 11, Calvignac in view of Meyer discloses means for disabling control inputs by setting said outputs of said buffers to a high

Art Unit: 2665

impedance state (Meyer: col. 2, lines 21-23), and wherein said interface controller is operable to disable all of said control inputs (Calvignac: col. 2, lines 33-36).

10. Regarding claims 6 and 13, referring to claims 1 and 11, Calvignac in view of Meyer discloses that said interfaces are serial port interfaces (Calvignac: col. 3, lines 44-50 and Meyer: col. 12, line 59-col. 13, line 15).

11. Regarding claims 7 and 14, referring to claims 6 and 13, Calvignac in view of Meyer discloses that said serial port interfaces are RS-232 serial port interfaces (Meyer: col. 12, line 59-col. 13, line 15).

12. Regarding claims 8 and 15, referring to claims 6 and 13, Calvignac in view of Meyer discloses that said output of said serial port interface is a transmit data output, and said input of said serial port interface is a receive data input (Meyer: col. 12, line 59-col. 13, line 67).

13. Regarding claims 9 and 16, referring to claims 7 and 14, Calvignac in view of Meyer discloses that said output of said serial port interface is a request to send output, and said input of said serial port interface is a clear to send input (Meyer: col. 12, line 59-col. 13, line 67).

14. Regarding claims 10 and 17, referring to claims 4 and 11, Calvignac in view of Meyer discloses that said interface controller is incorporated into one of said interfaces (Meyer: col. 4, lines 14-17).


Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Ryman whose telephone number is (571)272-3152. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:00-4:30 with every other Friday off.

Art Unit: 2665

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571)272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

 Daniel J. Ryman
Examiner
Art Unit 2665


HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600